South Coast
Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182
(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

SUBJECT: **NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

PROJECT TITLE: **CALIFORNIA CASCADE FONTANA, INC. WOOD TREATING PROCESS MODIFICATION PROJECT**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the Lead Agency and has prepared a Negative Declaration for the project identified above. The purpose of this Notice of Intent (NOI) is to solicit comments on the environmental analysis contained in the Negative Declaration.

The Negative Declaration has been prepared for the California Cascade Fontana, Inc. Wood Treating Process Modification Project. California Cascade Fontana is proposing to increase the quantity of shipment of NW-200 from 550 gallons to 6,000 gallons per shipment, and increase the average amount of NW-200 aboveground storage tank monthly throughput from 700 gallons to 10,000 gallons. Additionally, California Cascade Fontana is proposing to obtain shipment and storage review and approval for a new product, with a market trade name of Carbo-NT.

This letter, the NOI and the attached Draft Negative Declaration are not SCAQMD applications or forms requiring a response from you. Their purpose is simply to provide information to you on the above project. If the proposed project has no bearing on you or your organization, no action on your part is necessary. The proposed project's description, location, and potential adverse environmental impacts are described in the NOI and in the Draft Negative Declaration.

Comments relative to the environmental analysis should be addressed to Mr. Michael Krause at the address shown above, e-mailed to http://www.mkrause@aqmd.gov, or sent by FAX to (909) 396-3324. Comments must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 25, 2005. Please include the name and phone number of the contact person for your organization.

Project Applicant: California Cascade Fontana, Inc.

Date: April 26, 2005 **Signature:** Steve Smith

Steve Smith, Ph.D.
Program Supervisor
Planning, Rules, and Area Sources

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, California 91765-4182

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Title:
Negative Declaration: California Cascade Fontana, Inc. Wood Treating Process Modification Project

Project Location:
California Cascade Fontana, 8395 Sultana Avenue, Fontana, California

Description of Nature, Purpose, and Beneficiaries of Project:
California Cascade Fontana is proposing to increase the quantity of shipment of NW-200 from 550 gallons to 6,000 gallons per shipment, and increase the average amount of NW-200 aboveground storage tank monthly throughput from 700 gallons to 10,000 gallons. Additionally, California Cascade Fontana is proposing to obtain shipment and storage review and approval for a new product with a market trade name of Carbo-NT.

Lead Agency:	**Division:**
South Coast Air Quality Management District	Planning, Rule Development and Area Sources

Draft Negative Declaration and all Supporting Documentation are Available at:

SCAQMD Headquarters
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Or by Calling:
(909) 396-2039

Or Draft Negative Declaration is Available by Accessing:
http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/nonaqmd.html

The Public Notice of Completion is provided through the following:

☑ Los Angeles Times (04/26/05) ☑ AQMD Website ☑ AQMD Mailing List

Review Period:

April 26, 2005 through May 25, 2005

CEQA Contact Person:	**Phone Number:**	**E-Mail Address**
Michael Krause	(909)396-2706	mkrause@aqmd.gov

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Negative Declaration for:
California Cascade Fontana, Inc.
Wood Treating Process Modification Project

April 26, 2005

Executive Officer
Barry Wallerstein, D. Env.

Deputy Executive Officer
Planning, Rule Development, and Area Sources
Elaine Chang, DrPH

Assistant Deputy Executive Officer
Planning, Rule Development, and Area Sources
Laki Tisopulos, Ph.D, P.E.

Planning and Rules Manager
Susan Nakamura

Submitted to:
SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Prepared by:
ENGEO, INC.

Reviewed by: Michael Krause - Air Quality Specialist
Steve Smith, Ph.D. - Program Supervisor
Barbara Baird - Principal Deputy District Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES:

TABLES:

APPENDICES:

CHAPTER 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction
Agency Authority
Project Location
Overview of Current Operations
Proposed Project
Required Permits

INTRODUCTION

California Cascade Fontana, Inc. (CCF) is a commercial business that pressure treats commercial lumber for resale. CCF is an existing pressure treating facility located at 8395 Sultana Avenue within unincorporated San Bernardino, California. CCF is proposing to expand operations by increasing the volume of regulated chemicals transported to and stored at the site. The chemicals transported to and stored at CCF are regulated because of the ammonia content.

Activities at the CCF include the preparation of the lumber for chemical preservation, application of chemical preservatives in pressure vessels, drying of the freshly treated wood under controlled conditions, storage of the treated wood products pending sales, and shipment of products by truck. Products are shipped for resale home improvement type stores. The types of products prepared for resale include pressure treated fence posts, pressure treated fence slats, and pressure treated planking.

In January 2004, CCF converted from a wood treating process using chromium and arsenic based chemical solutions, to a process that uses one copper based chemical (NW-100C), and two ammonia based chemicals (NW-200 and DAC-Q). The current usage of NW-100C, NW-200 and DAC-Q are governed by existing SCAQMD permits.

CCF is proposing modifications to operations to allow for larger quantities of a regulated chemical (NW-200) to be shipped to CCF. Additionally, CCF is proposing that a new chemical, Carbo-NT be allowed for transport and use. This will allow CCF to better diversify their product lines. Altering the operations will require discretionary approvals from SCAQMD as new or modified permits must be filed

AGENCY AUTHORITY

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., requires that the environmental impacts of proposed "projects" be evaluated and that feasible methods to reduce, avoid or eliminate significant adverse impacts of these projects be identified and implemented. The proposed modifications constitute a "project" as defined by CEQA. To fulfill the purpose and intent of CEQA, the SCAQMD is the "lead agency" for this project and has prepared this Negative Declaration to address the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project at the CCF.

The lead agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project that may have a significant adverse effect upon the environment (Public Resources Code §21067). Since the SCAQMD has the greatest responsibility for supervising or approving the project as a whole, it was determined that the SCAQMD would be the most appropriate public agency to act as lead agency (CEQA Guidelines §15051(b)).

To fulfill the purpose and intent of CEQA, the SCAQMD has prepared this Negative Declaration to address the potential adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. A Negative Declaration for a project subject to CEQA is prepared when an environmental analysis

of the project shows that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15070(a)).

PROJECT LOCATION

CCF is located at 8395 Sultana Avenue in the unincorporated San Bernardino County, California (Figure 1-1). CCF is an existing wood preserving facility. CCF operated within the South Coast Air Quality Management District area of jurisdiction. The western boundary of CCF is Sultana Avenue. CCF is surrounded by other industrial facilities including other wood preserving facilities. Specifically, Ramirez Pallets occupies the area to the south, Universal Forrest Products occupies the area to the north, Superior Electric occupies the area to the west and Mac Steel occupies the area to the east.

OVERVIEW OF CURRENT OPERATIONS

CCF is in the commercial business of pressure treating lumber for retail sale and is situated within an industrial area on a 10.8-acre site in San Bernardino County (see Figures 1-2 & 1-3). Activities at the CCF include the preparation of the lumber for chemical preservation, application of chemical preservatives in pressure vessels, drying of the freshly treated wood under controlled conditions, storage of the treated wood products pending sales, and shipment of products by truck.

Untreated lumber is transported to CCF by both rail and truck. Upon arrival, the untreated lumber is first processed at CCF by passing it piece-by-piece through an incisor machine. This operation is carried out in a 200 square foot building. The incisor scores the surface of the lumber with numerous knife cuts to facilitate the penetration of the wood preserving chemicals. After incising, forklift trucks move the lumber to the wood treatment area to be loaded into a pressure vessel (retort) that is then flooded with a diluted mixture of the treatment chemicals. After one to three hours of infusion by the chemicals, the lumber is allowed to drip dry on a protected surface. When dry, the treated lumber is stored in one of three 20,000 square foot storage buildings pending shipment to customers. A layout of the wood treatment area is depicted on Figure 1-3.

In January 2004, CCF converted from a wood treating process using chromium and arsenic based chemical solutions, to a process that uses one copper based chemical (NW-100C), and two ammonia based chemicals (NW-200 and DAC-Q). The current usage of NW-100C, NW-200 and DAC-Q are governed by existing SCAQMD permits. These chemicals are regulated by SCACQMD due to the presence of ammonia (NH_3) in their composition.

Chemicals transported into CCF (currently NW-100C and NW-200) are stored in the two 9,400 gallons AST's shown on Figure 1-3. The remainder of the storage tanks within the wood treatment area either store unregulated substances (colorant and borate), or store significantly water-diluted mixtures of NW-100C, NW-200 and/or DAC-Q in the work tanks shown on Figure 1-3. These chemicals are briefly described in the following bullet points:

NW-100C is a copper based solution with no free ammonia used in the wood preservation process. The monthly throughput for the NW-100C aboveground storage tank (AST) is currently limited to 166,700 gallons (SCAQMD Permit No. F65146). There are no proposed changes for the use of NW-100C at CCF.

- NW-200 is an ammonia and copper based solution with an ammonia content of 9.3 percent used in the wood preservation process. Currently, the transport of NW-200 into the CCF is limited to a maximum quantity of 550 gallons per shipment. The monthly throughput for the NW-200 AST is currently limited to 700 gallons (SCAQMD Permit No. F65145).

- DAC-Q is an ammonium chloride based solution used in the wood preservation process. Currently, the use of DAC-Q within the CCF is limited to the onsite storage of DAC-Q in five 275 gallon totes (SCAQMD Permits No. F65147 through F65151). The use of DAC-Q will be terminated concurrent with approval of the chemical usage changes that are part of the proposed project. Although the use of DAC-Q will be terminated upon approval of the proposed project, existing SCAQMD permits allowing the onsite storage of DAC-Q will be maintained in force in the event the use of DAC-Q is necessary in the future.

PROPOSED OPERATION MODIFICATIONS

The proposed project will result in changes in the transport to and onsite use of regulated chemicals. The proposed project will be limited to increasing the quantities of wood treating chemicals transported to CCF, thus increasing the quantity of wood treated. No new construction is planned for CCF as part of this proposed project. The modifications to the process as part of the proposed project at CCF are as follows:

- CCF is proposing to increase the quantity of shipment of NW-200 from 550 gallons to 6,000 gallons per shipment, and increase the average amount of NW-200 AST monthly throughput from 700 gallons to 10,000 gallons.

- CCF is proposing to obtain shipment and storage review and approval for a new product, with a market trade name of Carbo-NT. Carbo-NT, which is referred to as Carboquat® by the manufacturer, has not been subjected to regulatory review previously and is an ammonium carbonate based solution designed to replace the current usage of DAC-Q. Carbo-NT, as documented by the manufacturer, contains no free ammonia as NH_3 nor contains any other listed chemical components subject to CEQA review. A signed letter from the manufacturer of Carbo-NT attesting that Carbo-NT contains no free ammonia is included in Appendix B. CCF is proposing to initiate the shipment of Carbo-NT in 6,000 gallon quantities and initiate AST storage with an average monthly throughput of 7,500 gallons. CCF will file the necessary SCAQMD permit application forms for the onsite storage of Carbo-NT in a 9,400 gallon AST (location shown on Figure 1-3).

REQUIRED PERMITS

The Proposed Project will require permits to construct and operate from SCAQMD. Since no new construction is anticipated in conjunction with this project, no additional permitting requirements are anticipated.

CHAPTER 2

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

INTRODUCTION

The environmental checklist provides a standard evaluation tool to identify a project's adverse environmental impacts. This checklist identifies and evaluates potential adverse environmental impacts that may be created by the proposed project.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:	California Cascade Fontana Wood Treating Process Modification Project
Lead Agency Name:	South Coast Air Quality Management District
Lead Agency Address:	21865 Copley Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91765
Contact Person:	Michael Krause
Contact Phone Number:	(909) 396-2706
Project Sponsor's Name:	California Cascade Fontana
Project Sponsor's Address:	8395 Sultana Avenue Fontana, CA 92335
General Plan Designation:	Regional Industrial
Zoning:	IR-Regional Industrial
Description of Project:	CCF is proposing to increase the quantity of shipment of NW-200 from 550 gallons to 6,000 gallons per shipment, and increase the average amount of NW-200 AST monthly throughput from 700 gallons to 10,000 gallons. Additionally, CCF is proposing to obtain shipment and storage review and approval for a new product, with a market trade name of Carbo-NT.
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:	Sultana Avenue borders CCF to the west. A branch line of the Southern Pacific Railroad (Union Pacific) borders CCF to the east. Industrial facilities and other wood preserving facilities border CCF to the north and south.
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:	None

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AREAS

The following environmental impact areas have been assessed to determine their potential to be affected by the proposed project. As indicated by the checklist on the following pages, environmental topics marked with an "✓" may be adversely affected by the proposed project. An explanation relative to the determination of impacts can be found following the checklist for each area.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology/Soils	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology/ Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Solid/Hazardous Waste	☐ Transportation/ Traffic	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☑ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and that a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be significant effects in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Date: April 26, 2005 Signature: Steve Smith

Steve Smith, Ph.D.
Program Supervisor
Planning, Rules, and Area Sources

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS				
Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☑
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☑

1.1 Significance Criteria

The proposed project impacts on aesthetics will be considered significant if:

- The project will block views from a scenic highway or corridor.
- The project will adversely affect the visual continuity of the surrounding area.
- The impacts on light and glare will be considered significant if the project adds lighting which would add glare to residential areas or sensitive receptors.

1.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a), b) and c) No new site construction or building permits are anticipated for the proposed chemical transport and storage changes proposed for CCF. Additionally, the proposed bulk transportation of NW-200 and Carbo-NT will reduce the numbers of truck trips to CCF due to eliminating the use of DAC-Q. This proposed project will allow for the use of tanker trucks instead of delivery type trucks. These trucks will also allow for fewer shipments to CCF. This will reduce the visual impact of transport to CCF along scenic highways. Views of CCF from adjacent properties will not change. The permits being processed as part of this proposed project are not anticipated to require a vapor recovery system or Best Available Control Technology (BACT). However, if BACT is required, off the shelf hardware can be used similar to a carbon

absorber that can be installed on existing equipment. The installation of this BACT would be done with existing staff and would not require construction. Therefore, no visual impacts are expected from the proposed project.

d) No new site construction or building permits are anticipated for the proposed upgrades to CCF. The proposed project components will be located within existing industrial facilities, which are currently lighted at night for nighttime operations. The proposed changes do not required any additional or increased lighting. No increases of light and glare are anticipated from the modifications to CCF operations.

1.3 Mitigation Measures

Based on the above information, no significant adverse impacts to aesthetics are expected to occur as a result of modifications to CCF. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES Would the project:				
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☑

2.1 Significance Criteria

Project related impacts on agricultural resources will be considered significant if any of the following conditions are met:

- The proposed project conflicts with existing zoning or agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.

- The proposed project will convert prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland mapping and monitoring program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

- The proposed project would involve changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

2.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a), b), and c) There are no agricultural resources, (i.e., food crops grown for commercial purposes), located in or near the vicinity of CCF. No new site construction or building permits are anticipated for the proposed upgrades to CCF. The proposed CCF changes will not involve construction outside of the existing boundaries of CCF and no agricultural resources are located within CCF. The zoning of CCF will remain general industrial. The transportation of bulk chemicals to CCF will continue to require using existing roadways and highways. No existing agricultural land will be converted to non-agricultural land uses. For the same reasons identified here, the proposed project will not conflict with any Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, the proposed project will have no significant adverse impacts on agricultural resources.

2.3 Mitigation Measures

Based on the above information, no significant adverse impacts to agricultural resources are expected to occur as a result of modifications to CCF. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☑

d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☑
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☑
f)	Diminish an existing air quality rule or future compliance requirement resulting in a significant increase in air pollutant(s)?	☐	☐	☑

3.1 Significance Criteria

Air quality impacts will be evaluated and compared to the significance listed in Table 2-1. If impacts equal or exceed any of the criteria in Table 2-1, they will be considered significant.

TABLE 2-1
AIR QUALITY SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

Mass Daily Thresholds		
Pollutant	**Construction**	**Operation**
NOx (Oxides of Nitrogen)	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
VOCs (Volatile Organic Compounds)	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
PM10 (Particulate Matter)	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
Sox (Sulfer Oxide)	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
CO (Carbon Monoxide)	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day
Lead	3 lbs/day	3 lbs/day
Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) and Odor Thresholds		
TACs (including carcinogens and non-carcinogens)	Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk $\geq$ 10 in 1 million Hazard Index $\geq$ 1.0 (project increment) Hazard Index $\geq$ 3.0 (facility-wide)	
Odor	Project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402	
Ambient Air Quality for Criteria Pollutants		
NO_2 1-hour average annual average	SCAQMD is in attainment; project is significant if it causes or Contributes to an exceedance of the following attainment standards: 0.25 ppm (state) 0.053 ppm (federal)	
PM10: 24-hour average annual geometric mean annual arithmetic mean	10.4 ug/m^3 (recommended for construction) 2.5 ug/m^3 (operation) 1.0 ug/m^3 20 ug/m^3	
Sulfate: 24-hour average	1 ug/m^3	
CO 1-hour average 8-hour average	SCAQMD is in attainment; project is significant if it causes or contributes to an exceedance of the following attainment standards: 20 ppm (state) 9.0 ppm (federal)	

3.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a) and f) An inventory of existing emissions from industrial facilities is included in the baseline inventory in the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP identifies emission reductions from existing sources and air pollution control measures that are necessary in order to comply with the state and federal ambient air quality standards (SCAQMD, 2003). The control strategies in the AQMP are based on projections from the local general plans provided by the cities in the district. Projects that are consistent with the local General Plans are generally considered to be consistent with the air quality related regional plans. The San Bernardino General Plan dated October 11, 1999 was completed during a time when CCF was open and in production. CCF is within an area of San Bernardino County zoned for general industrial uses. The proposed project is considered to be consistent with the air quality related regional plans since it is consistent with the San Bernardino County General Plan.

The 2003 AQMP demonstrates that applicable ambient air quality standards can be achieved within the timeframes required under federal law. This proposed project must comply with applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations measures for new or modified sources. For example, new emission sources associated with the proposed project are required to comply with the SCAQMD's Regulation XIII-New Source Review requirements that include the use of BACT. The project proponent must also comply with prohibitory rules, such as Rule 403, for the control of fugitive dust. By meeting these requirements, the project will be consistent with the goals and objectives of the AQMP to improve air quality in the Basin. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the applicable air quality management plans and is not expected to diminish an existing air quality rule or a future compliance requirement.

b) The proposed CCF changes will not violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The proposed project includes applications for new SCAQMD permits for the storage and usage of the NW-200 and Carbo-NT quantities discussed herein. The current and proposed operations at CCF do not emit any toxic air contaminants. The proposed CCF changes will not require any new pumps or additional tanks (stationary sources) that might generate pollutant emissions. Regarding the mobile source of emissions via the truck transport of chemicals to CCF, the proposed changes in chemical usage will result in a reduced number of truck trips to CCF per year as summarized in Table 2-2.

TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF TRUCK TRIPS PER YEAR

Chemical	Current Transport Quantity	Current Trips/Year	Proposed Transport Quantity	Proposed Trips/Year	Net Change in Trips/Year
DAC-Q	1,100 gallons	48	0	0	-48
NW-200	500 gallons	15	6,000 gallons	15	0
Carbo-NT	0	0	6,000 gallons	20	+20
TOTAL TRIPS/YEAR		**63**		**35**	**-28**

Existing mobile source emissions from truck transport of chemicals to CCF, an approximately 380-mile one-way trip originating in Stockton, California. Truck vehicle daily mass emissions were calculated using the most conservative emission factors obtained from the weighted EMFAC 2002 emission factors for both On-Road Vehicles/Delivery Trucks (vehicles greater than 8,500 pounds) and emission factors specific to Heavy-Heavy Duty Diesel Trucks. The purpose for calculating emissions using two separate vehicle category types is because both vehicle types, delivery trucks and heavy-heavy duty diesel trucks, will be used in future deliveries as part of the proposed project, whereas the existing transportation to the facility is being accomplished through the use of delivery trucks. For a "worst-case" scenario, the more conservative factors of the heavy-heavy duty category are used to calculate transportation emissions from the proposed project. The on-road vehicle emission factors are derived from CARB's BURDEN 2002 models for the year 2005. The calculated current and proposed daily truck mass emissions rates are summarized in Table 2-3 and are compared to the SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds.

Currently no more than one truck trip per day occurs transporting process chemicals to CCF. The proposed project will result in no more than one truck trip per day delivering process chemicals to CCF. Based on the comparison between current daily emissions and future expected emissions, there is a slight, but insignificant increase in daily emissions per trip. The worst case scenario would be the unlikely event that two trips to CCF would occur in one day. In this theoretical scenario the total annual truck trips would remain unchanged. The truck trips to this facility originate from outside the SCAQMD region but transportation emissions are projected to be low and would not be significant.

TABLE 2-3
INDIRECT VEHICLE MASS EMISSION PROJECT CONSEQUENCES

Transportation Scenario	**Air Quality Parameters and Calculated Daily Vehicle Mass Emission Rates (lbs/day)**			
Current Transportation (On Road Vehicles–Delivery Trucks)	CO	PM10	NO_X	SO_X
DAC-Q/NW-200 (lbs/day for trips per day completed)	7.9	0.19	10.7	0.09
Proposed Transportation (Heavy Heavy Duty Diesel Trucks)	CO	PM10	NO_X	SO_X
DAC-Q (0 trips)	0	0	0	0
Carbo-NT/NW-200 (lbs/day for trips per day completed)	2.4	0.3	15.8	0.15
SCAQMD Significance Thresholds (lbs/day from Table 2-1)	**550**	**150**	**55**	**150**
Any Significance Thresholds Exceeded?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Regarding the reduction in the number of annual chemical truck delivery trips to CCF, Table 2-4 summarizes the calculated annual emissions from the delivery vehicles currently transporting chemicals to CCF. Using the Heavy Heavy Duty Diesel Trucks emission estimates, the annual truck emissions for the proposed delivery scenario of chemicals to CCF were also calculated and are summarized in Table 2-4. When the existing and proposed emissions are compared, a

substantial reduction in annual emissions is expected as a result of implementing the proposed project. This analysis of annual air quality effects is provided for information only as air quality impacts are based on the effects of the proposed project on daily emissions.

TABLE 2-4
ANNUAL AIR QUALITY EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Transportation Scenario	**Air Quality Parameters and Calculated Annual Vehicle Mass Emission Rates (lbs/year)**			
Current Transportation	CO	PM10	NO_X	SO_X
DAC-Q/NW-200 (63 trips/year)	502	12	674	5.9
Proposed Transportation	CO	PM10	NO_X	SO_X
DAC-Q (0 trips/year)	0	0	0	0
Carbo-NT/NW-200 (35 trips/year)	84	10.5	553	5.4
Total Emission Change (lbs/year)	**-418**	**-1.5**	**-121**	**-0.5**

c) CCF changes will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. As shown in Table 2-3, project-specific emissions are substantially less than the applicable daily significance thresholds and therefore are not considered to be cumulatively considerable as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15065(a)(3). Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to generate significant adverse cumulative air quality impacts.

d), e) and f) Air quality modeling that has been completed as part of the permitting process for this proposed project. The purpose of the modeling was to determine the quantity of fugitive ammonia (NH_3) released from the stationary tank source (NW-200). The air quality modeling indicates that applicable air quality standards will be maintained through these CCF changes. Modeling is discussed relative to sensitive receptors because modeling shows whether or not sensitive receptors are affected by a particular project. Through this modeling, sensitive receptors will not be apparently exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. Air emission modeling completed for the increased usage of NW-200 and the proposed usage of Carbo-NT predicts a less than one pound per day onsite emission rate of ammonia (NH_3) for the NW-200 and water for the Carbo-NT onsite storage. In addition, since there is little to no odor associated with the chemicals proposed for usage as reported in the Material Safety Data Sheets, no creation of objectionable odors is anticipated. The permits being processed as part of this proposed project are not anticipated to require a vapor recovery system or Best Available Control Technology (BACT). However, if BACT is required, off the shelf hardware can be used similar to a carbon absorber that can be installed on existing equipment. The installation of this BACT would be done with existing staff and would not require construction.

Stationary source emissions of concern are limited to fugitive ammonia (NH_3) from the NW-200. The stationary fugitive emissions are projected to be less than one pound per day. Due to the ammonia (NH_3) content of the NW-200, the SCAQMD is the lead agency. Since the fugitive

ammonia (NH_3) does not exceed the lowest achievable emission rate (LAER), they are deemed fugitive. No air quality offsets are required for CCF.

3.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to air quality are expected to occur as a result of proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☑
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☑
e)	Conflicting with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☑

f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☑

4.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts on biological resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

- The project results in a loss of plant communities or animal habitat considered to be rare, threatened or endangered by federal, state or local agencies.
- The project interferes substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory wildlife species.
- The project adversely affects aquatic communities through construction or operation of the project.

4.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a), b), c), d), e), and f) The proposed project would be located entirely within the existing boundaries of the CCF, which has already been developed, therefore, no conflict with local, regional or state Conservation Plans are expected. The area contains industrial activities and does not support riparian habitat, habitat for any threatened or endangered species, federally protected wetlands, or migratory corridors.

4.3 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required since no significant adverse impacts to biological resources are expected.

		Potentially Significant Impact	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☑

b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☑
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside a formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☑

5.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts to cultural resources will be considered significant if:

- The project results in the disturbance of a significant prehistoric or historic archaeological site or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social group.
- Unique paleontological resources are present that could be disturbed by construction of the proposed project.
- The project would disturb human remains.

5.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a), b), c), and d) Because the proposed project does not include construction of any structures, it will result in no ground-disturbing activities and no significant adverse impacts to equipment and structures over 50 years of age, which may be culturally significant, are anticipated to occur. No existing structures at the CCF are considered architecturally or historically significant, as defined under CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, i.e., no structures are eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historic resources. The entire CCF has been previously graded and developed. No known human remains or burial sites have been identified at CCF during previous construction activities. The larger CCF structures and equipment are supported on existing concrete foundations. No adverse impacts to cultural resources are expected since no known cultural resources are located within the CCF.

5.3 Mitigation Measures

The impacts of the proposed project on cultural resources are less than significant so that no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Result in the need for new or substantially altered power or natural gas utility systems?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Create any significant effects on local or regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional energy?	☐	☐	☑
d)	Create any significant effects on peak and base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy?	☐	☐	☑
e)	Comply with existing energy standards?	☐	☐	☑

6.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts to energy and mineral resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria are met:

- The project conflicts with adopted energy conservation plans or standards.
- The project results in substantial depletion of existing energy resource supplies.
- An increase in demand for utilities impacts the current capacities of the electric and natural gas utilities.
- The project uses non-renewable resources in a wasteful and/or inefficient manner.

6.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a) and e) The proposed changes to CCF and transportation of bulk chemicals is not expected to conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans or standards because there is no known energy conservation plan or standards that would apply to CCF. Since the proposed project will allow for greater utilization of the existing process without the addition of a large quantity of new treatment cycles, the proposed project is not expected to greatly increase the output or energy demands of CCF. No increase in electricity demand is expected during the modifications

to the equipment at CCF that might affect peak demand period for electricity or other forms of energy.

b), c) and d) CCF is currently served by Southern California Edison (SCE) for electricity supply. No new pumps or other equipment are planned for installation that could increase the energy demand from CCF. Additionally, changes in quantities of NW-200 transported to CCF are expected to produce operational changes in the finished product and not the overall output. Therefore, the change in NW-200 transported to CCF is not anticipated to produce a significant increase in energy usage. Therefore, no significant impacts on energy are expected during this period. The permits being processed as part of this proposed project are not anticipated to require a vapor recovery system or Best Available Control Technology (BACT). However, if BACT is required, off-the-shelf hardware can be used similar to a carbon absorber that can be installed on existing equipment. The installation of this BACT would be done with existing staff and would not require construction. No additional energy is typically required to use this type of BACT.

6.3 Mitigation Measures

The impacts of the proposed project on energy resources are less than significant so that no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:			
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☑
• Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	☑
• Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☑	☐
• Seismic–related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☑	☐
• Landslides?	☐	☐	☑
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of	☐	☐	☑

topsoil?

c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☑
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☑
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☑

7.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts on the geological environment will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

- Topographic alterations would result in significant changes, disruptions, displacement, excavation, and compaction or over covering of large amounts of soil.
- Unique geological resources (paleontological resources or unique outcrops) are present that could be disturbed by the construction of the proposed project.
- Exposure of people or structures to major geologic hazards such as earthquake surface rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction or landslides.
- Secondary seismic effects could occur which could damage facility structures, e.g., liquefaction.
- Other geological hazards exist which could adversely affect CCF, e.g., landslides, mudslides.

7.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a) CCF is located within the City of Fontana, San Bernardino County and is located within a seismically active region. The most significant potential geologic hazard at CCF is estimated to be seismic shaking from future earthquakes generated by active or potentially active faults in the region. Table 2-5 identifies those faults considered important to CCF in terms of potential for future activity. Seismic records have been available for the last 200 years, with improved instrumental seismic records available for the past 50 years. Based on a review of earthquake data, most of the earthquake epicenters occur along the Whittier-Elsinore, San Andreas,

Newport-Inglewood, Malibu-Santa Monica-Raymond Hills, Palos Verdes, Sierra Madre, San Fernando, Elysian Park-Montebello, and Torrance- faults (Jones and Hauksson, 1986). All these faults are elements of the San Andreas Fault system. Past experience indicates that there has not been any substantial damage, structural or otherwise to CCF as a result of earthquakes. Table 2-6 identifies the historic earthquakes over magnitude 4.5 in Southern California, between 1915 and the present, along various faults in the region.

TABLE 2-5
MAJOR ACTIVE/POTENTIALLY ACTIVE FAULTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Fault Zone	Distance to Fault (miles)	Maximum Earthquake Magnitude	Peak Site Acceleration (g)
SAN JACINTO- San Bernardino	6	6.7	0.49
CUCAMONGA	7	7	0.42
SAN ANDREAS - San Bernardino	11	7.3	0.32
SAN ANDREAS - Southern	11	7.4	0.33
SAN JOSE	13	6.5	0.19
CLEGHORN	14	6.5	0.16
SAN JACINTO-San Jacinto Valley	15	6.9	0.19
SAN ANDREAS - 1857 Rupture	15	7.8	0.33
SAN ANDREAS - Mojave	15	7.1	0.22
SIERRA MADRE	15	7	0.22
CHINO-CENTRAL AVE. (Elsinore)	17	6.7	0.16
NORTH FRONTAL FAULT ZONE	18	7	0.18
WHITTIER	20	6.8	0.13
ELSINORE-GLEN IVY	20	6.8	0.13
ELYSIAN PARK THRUST	25	6.7	0.10
CLAMSHELL-SAWPIT	25	6.5	0.08
RAYMOND	31	6.5	0.06
ELSINORE-TEMECULA	33	6.8	0.07
COMPTON THRUST	36	6.8	0.06
VERDUGO	37	6.7	0.06
HELENDALE - S. LOCKHARDT	38	7.1	0.08

TABLE 2-5 (CONCLUDED)
MAJOR ACTIVE/POTENTIALLY ACTIVE FAULTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Fault Zone	Distance to Fault (miles)	Maximum Earthquake Magnitude	Peak Site Acceleration (g)
NORTH FRONTAL FAULT ZONE	39	6.7	0.05
SAN JACINTO-ANZA	40	7.2	0.08
NEWPORT-INGLEWOOD (L.A.Basin)	43	6.9	0.05
PINTO MOUNTAIN	43	7	0.06
NEWPORT-INGLEWOOD (Offshore)	44	6.9	0.05
HOLLYWOOD	44	6.4	0.04
SAN GABRIEL	49	7	0.05
SIERRA MADRE (San Fernando)	49	6.7	0.04
LENWOOD-LOCKHART-OLD WOMAN SPRGS	50	7.3	0.06
PALOS VERDES	52	7.1	0.05
JOHNSON VALLEY (Northern)	54	6.7	0.03
SANTA MONICA	54	6.6	0.03
NORTHRIDGE (E. Oak Ridge)	55	6.9	0.04
ELSINORE-JULIAN	56	7.1	0.05
SAN ANDREAS - Coachella	59	7.1	0.04
LANDERS	59	7.3	0.05

Notes: g = acceleration of gravity.

TABLE 2-6
SIGNIFICANT HISTORICAL EARTHQUAKES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Date	Location (Epicenter)	Magnitude
1915	Imperial Valley	6.3
1925	Santa Barbara	6.3
1920	Inglewood	4.9
1933	Long Beach	6.3
1940	El Centro	6.7

TABLE 2-6 (CONCLUDED)
SIGNIFICANT HISTORICAL EARTHQUAKES IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Date	Location (Epicenter)	Magnitude
1940	Santa Monica	4.7
1941	Gardena	4.9
1941	Torrance	5.4
1947	Mojave Desert	6.2
1951	Imperial Valley	5.6
1968	Borrego Mountain	6.5
1971	Sylmar	6.4
1975	Mojave Desert	5.2
1979	Imperial Valley	6.6
1987	Whittier	5.9
1992	Joshua Tree	6.3
1992	Landers	7.4
1992	Big Bear	6.5
1994	Northridge	6.7
1999	Hector Mine	7.1

Sources: Bolt (1988), Jennings (1985), Gere and Shah (1984), Source Fault Hazard Zones in California (1988), Yanev (1974), and personnel communication with the California Division of Mines and Geology.

San Jacinto – San Bernardino Fault Zone: The San Jacinto fault system cross the Los Angeles Basin about six miles to the northeast of CCF. The San Jacinto fault is a major active fault that is considered capable of producing a 6.7 magnitude earthquake.

Sierra Madre Fault System: The Sierra Madre fault system extends for approximately 60 miles along the northern edge of the densely populated San Fernando and San Gabriel valleys (Dolan, et al., 1995) and includes faults that have participated in the Quaternary uplift of the San Gabriel Mountains. The fault system is complex and appears to be broken into five or six segments each 10 to 15 miles in length (Ehlig, 1975). The fault system is divided into three major faults by Dolan, et al. (1995), including the Sierra Madre, the Cucamonga and the Clamshell-Sawpit faults. The San Jose fault is a southwesterly extension of the Cucamonga fault. The Sierra Madre fault is considered capable of producing a 7.3 magnitude earthquake every 800 years (Dolan, et al., 1995).

San Andreas Fault Zone: The San Andreas fault is located on the north side of the San Gabriel Mountains trending east-southeast as it passes the Los Angeles Basin. This fault is recognized as the longest and most active fault in California. It is generally characterized as a right-lateral strike-slip fault which is comprised of numerous sub-parallel faults in a zone over two miles wide. There is a high probability that southern California will experience a magnitude 7.0 or greater earthquake along the San Andreas or San Jacinto fault zones, which could generate strong ground motion within CCF. There is a five to twelve percent probability of such an event

occurring in southern California during any one of the next five years and a cumulative 47 percent chance of such an event occurring over a five year period (Reich, 1992).

Whittier-Elsinore Fault Zone: The Whittier-Elsinore Fault is located about 20 miles southwest of CCF. The Whittier fault is one of the more prominent structural features in the Los Angeles Basin. It extends from Turnbull Canyon near Whittier, southeast to the Santa Ana River, where it merges with the Elsinore fault. Yerkes (1972) indicated that vertical separation on the fault in the upper Miocene strata increases from approximately 2,000 feet at the Santa Ana River northwestward to approximately 14,000 feet in the Brea-Olinda oil field. Farther to the northwest, the vertical separation decreases to approximately 3,000 feet in the Whittier Narrows of the San Gabriel River. The fault also has a major right-lateral strike slip component. Yerkes (1972) indicates streams along the fault have been deflected in a right-lateral sense from 4,000 to 5,000 feet. The fault is capable of producing a maximum credible earthquake event of about magnitude 7.0 every 500 to 700 years.

In addition to the known surface faults, shallow-dipping concealed "blind" thrust faults have been postulated to underlie portions of the Los Angeles Basin. Because there exist few data to define the potential extent of rupture planes associated with these concealed thrust faults, the maximum earthquake that they might generate is largely unknown.

No faults or fault-related features are known to exist in the immediate area of CCF. CCF is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone and is not expected to be subject to significant surface fault displacement. Therefore, no significant impacts to CCF are expected from seismically-induced ground rupture.

Based on the historical record, it is highly probable that earthquakes will affect the Los Angeles region in the future. Research shows that damaging earthquakes will occur on or near recognized faults which show evidence of recent geologic activity. The proximity of major faults to CCF increases the probability that an earthquake may impact CCF. There is the potential for damage in the event of an earthquake. Impacts of an earthquake could include structural failure, spills, etc. from existing structures. The hazards of a release during an earthquake are addressed in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section. However, since there are no new structures planned for construction as part of this proposed project, no new structures would be affected by ground shaking or ground failure including liquefaction and landslide.

b) Concrete foundations presently support several of the structures and equipment currently located within CCF. Most of CCF roads, parking area, and raw material storage areas have been paved. The western boundary of CCF has also been landscaped. CCF is relatively flat. No unstable earth conditions, changes in topography or changes in geologic substructures are anticipated to occur with CCF because no grading and excavation will be involved. No significant impacts on topography and soils are expected.

c) and d) Liquefaction would most likely occur in unconsolidated granular sediments that are water saturated less than 30 feet below ground surface (Tinsley et al., 1985). The Geologic Hazard Overlay of the San Bernardino County Official Land Use Plan (plotted 2004), indicates that the site is not within an area that is susceptible to liquefaction or landsliding.

e) The proposed project is expected to generate no additional wastewater. Wastewater is currently discharged to a permitted septic system currently in place within CCF (Figures 1-2 & 1-3). Waste from the chemical processes within CCF are collected and reused, not discharged into the septic system. Since there are no plans to increase the size of the work force at CCF, increased industrial discharge to the septic system will not take place and thus, no modifications to the septic system are anticipated for this proposed project.

7.3 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for the construction/operation of the project since no significant adverse impacts to geology or soils are expected.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**			
Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☑	☐
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☑	☐
c)	Emit hazardous emissions, or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☑
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☑
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard	☐	☐	☑

	for people residing or working in the project area?			
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☑
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☑
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☑
i)	Significantly increased fire hazard in areas with flammable materials?	☐	☐	☑

8.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts associated with hazards will be considered significant if any of the following occur:

- The proposed project increases the quantity of hazardous materials stored aboveground onsite or transported by mobile vehicle to or from the site by greater than or equal to the amounts associated with the compounds on the Regulated Substances List and Threshold Quantities for Accidental Release Prevention (ARP List), California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5 (ARP Regulations). Hazardous materials used in excess of quantities contained in the ARP List require the preparation of a Risk Management Plan (RMP) under the California ARP regulations. Pursuant to the California ARP regulations, the RMP is to be submitted to the Administering Authority, which based on location of CCF, is the San Bernardino Country Fire Department.

- The proposed project creates a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, either during transport, or from onsite storage and usage.

- The proposed project impairs implementation of or physically interferes with an adopted emergency response or emergency evacuation plan.

8.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a) and b) CCF is in the business of preserving wood products through a chemical treatment process that utilizes copper and ammonia based chemicals that are transported into CCF. The hazardous materials classification for the chemicals transported to and used at CCF is governed by the ammonia content of the individual chemicals, since all of the chemicals imported to,

stored and used at CCF are solutions containing varying percentages of chemical components and water.

For the purposes of this Negative Declaration, the hazards and hazardous materials analysis will be conducted for the following proposed CCF changes:

- Increased quantities of storage and transport of NW-200, a chemical solution with an ammonia content of 9.3 percent by weight. NW-200 is regulated under the ARP List due to ammonia (NH_3) content. We will refer to this NH_3 containing compound as NW-200 throughout this document. The potential impacts due to an accidental release of ammonia during transport, transfer to storage, or ruptured storage.

- New transport and storage of Carbo-NT, a chemical solution with no free ammonia. While presented herein for informational and disclosure purposes, the transport and onsite storage of Carbo-NT, is not subject to the requirements of the California ARP regulations.

Hazard Analysis

The onsite storage of the increased quantity of NW-200 does not increase the potential of an accidental onsite spill and release, as compared to the current quantities of NW-200 stored onsite. The greatest potential for an onsite spill and release event has been previously identified to be associated with the filling operation for the NW-200 AST. Relative to the hazards associated with a potential onsite spill and release event for NW-200, a report was previously prepared by PARSONS ("Air Dispersion Modeling Study, Worst-Case Release Scenario for Storage of Ammoniacal (NW-200) Cooper Solution, September 2003) to evaluate the risks of an NW-200 spill and release event associated with the existing 9,400 gallon NW-200 AST.

The PARSONS study evaluated the potential for air dispersion health risk effects associated with onsite releases from the NW-200 AST operations. A copy of the PARSONS air dispersion modeling study is included in Appendix D. The conclusions from the PARSONS study indicated that based on the worst case scenario outcome from an NW-200 AST overfilling event, the NW-200 storage and handling process is eligible for a RMP Program Level 1 classification. In the event of a worst-case release, concentrations at the fence line would not be high enough to reach levels that would cause serious health effects. Based on the proposed increase in the shipment and usage of NW-200, the potential for an overfilling event associated with the NW-200 AST is not increased since the filling operations will remain unchanged. Additionally, based on the increase shipment quantities of NW-200, a reduction in the number of shipments and fill events would not increase the likelihood of and overfilling event. Consequently, the enclosed air dispersion modeling study is valid for the proposed NW-200 chemical usage changes.

As required under the California ARP Regulations, a RMP was previously prepared for the onsite storage of NW-200. The current RMP was submitted to the San Bernardino County Fire Department in May 2004. It is assumed that changes in chemical usage proposed by CCF may require a revision of the current RMP. A copy of the RMP is included in Appendix E.

The permits being processed as part of this proposed project are not anticipated to require a vapor recovery system or Best Available Control Technology (BACT). However, if BACT is required, off the shelf hardware can be used similar to a carbon absorber that can be installed on existing equipment. The installation of this BACT would be done with existing staff and would not require construction.

Transportation Release Scenario

CCF will receive truck shipments of NW-200 from a rail terminal located in Stockton, California. The distance from the Stockton supply location to CCF is approximately 400 miles. Deliveries of NW-200 would be made to CCF by tanker truck via public roads. The capacity of the tanker trucks is 5,000 to 6,000 gallons. Based on the projected annual usage of NW-200 (100,000 gallons per year), delivery frequency from the supplier to CCF would be one to two trucks per month (approximately 15 trucks per year). Regulations for the transport of hazardous materials by public highway are described in 49 Code of Federal Regulations 173 and 177.

Although trucking of hazardous materials is regulated for safety by the U.S. Department of Transportation, there is a possibility that a tanker truck could be involved in an accident spilling its contents. The factors that enter into accident statistics include distance traveled and type of vehicle or transportation system. Factors affecting automobiles and truck transportation accidents include the type of roadway, presence of road hazards, vehicle type, maintenance and physical condition, and driver training. A common reference frequently used in measuring risk of an accident is the number of accidents per million miles traveled. Complicating the assessment of risk is the fact that some accidents can cause significant damage without injury or fatality.

Every time hazardous materials are moved from the site of generation, opportunities are provided for accidental (unintentional) release. A study conducted by the U.S. EPA indicates that the expected number of hazardous materials spills per mile shipped ranges from one in 100 million to one in one million, depending on the type of road and transport vehicle used. The U.S. EPA analyzed accident and traffic volume data from New Jersey, California, and Texas, using the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Risk/Cost Analysis Model and calculated the accident involvement rates presented in Table 2-4. This information was summarized from the Los Angeles County Hazardous Waste Management Plan (Los Angeles County, 1988).

In the study completed by the U.S. EPA, cylinders, cans, glass, plastic, fiber boxes, tanks, metal drum/parts, and open metal containers were identified as usual container types. For each container type, the expected fractional release en route was calculated. The study concluded that the release rate for tank trucks is much lower than for any other container type (Los Angeles County, 1988).

The accident rates developed based on transportation in California were used to predict the accident rate associated with trucks transporting NW-200 to CCF. An average truck accident rate of 0.28 accident per million miles traveled equates to one truck accident for every 3.6 million miles traveled (Los Angeles County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, 1988). Based on an average of 15 truck trips per year traveling 400 miles per trip on California roadways, the

estimated accident rate associated with transporting NW-200 to CCF may result in one accident every 600 years.

TABLE 2-7
TRUCK ACCIDENT RATES FOR CARGO ON HIGHWAYS

Highway Type	Accidents Per 1,000,000 miles
Interstate	0.13
U.S. and State Highways	0.45
Urban Roadways	0.73
Composite (Average number for transport on interstates, highways, and urban roadways)	0.28

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1984.

The actual occurrence of an accidental release of a hazardous material cannot be predicted. The location of an accident or whether sensitive populations would be present in the immediate vicinity also cannot be identified. In general, the shortest and most direct route that takes the least amount of time would have the least risk of an accident. Hazardous material transporters do not routinely avoid populated areas along their routes, although they generally use approved truck routes that take population densities and sensitive populations into account.

The hazards associated with the transport of regulated (CCR Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5 or the CalARP requirements) hazardous materials, including NW-200, could include the potential exposure of individuals in the event of an accident that would lead to a spill. A route map for the transport of NW-200 from Stockton to CCF is shown on Figure 2-1. The route for NW-200 to reach CCF is as follows:

- Interstate 5 South from Stockton to Southern California
- Interstate 210 East toward Pasadena
- Interstate 605 South toward El Monte
- Interstate 10 East toward Ontario
- Interstate 15 North toward Fontana
- Foothill Boulevard East (2.5 miles)
- Cherry Avenue South (0.5 miles)
- Arrow Boulevard East (1.0 mile)
- Sultana Avenue North to Facility (0.25 miles)

The above describe truck route limits the travel to Interstate freeways and local commercial roads. At no time does the route pass through residential areas or school zones.

In the unlikely event that the tanker truck would rupture and release the entire 5,500 gallons of NW-200, the solution would have to pool and spread out over a flat surface in order to create sufficient evaporation of ammonia (NH_3) from the NW-200 to produce a significant vapor cloud. For a road accident, the roads are usually graded and channeled to prevent water accumulation and a spill would be channeled to a low spot or drainage system, which would limit the surface area of the spill and the subsequent toxic emissions. Additionally, the roadside surfaces may not be paved and may absorb some of the spill. Without this pooling effect on an impervious surface, the spilled ammonia would not evaporate into a toxic cloud and impact residences or other sensitive receptors in the area of the spill. To avoid roadways that are not channeled, the designated transportation route will consist of the Interstate freeway system and arterial roadways through areas zoned for industrial activities. By increasing the quantity of NW-200 transported in each shipment, fewer trips will be required from the point of origin to CCF. The secondary containment within the proposed tanker truck type transport is likely to release less NW-200 than would happen if an accident were to occur under existing transport conditions without secondary containment. The reduced number to trips also reduces the risk of a tanker truck rupture.

Based on the improbability of an NW-200 tanker truck accident with a major release, its potential severity if it did occur, the conclusion of this analysis is that potential impacts due to accidental release of ammonia during transportation are less than significant.

c) No existing or proposed schools are located within one-quarter mile of the existing Facility, so that no significant adverse impacts are expected to a school. No schools are located in the immediate vicinity of the transport route as part of the proposed facility.

d) The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; therefore, no significant hazards related to hazardous materials at the site on the environment or to the public are expected.

e) and f) The proposed project site is not within an airport land use plan or within about five miles of a public or private airport. Therefore, no safety hazards are expected from the proposed project on any airports in the region.

g) The proposed project is not expected to interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The proposed project is not expected to alter the route that employees would take to evacuate CCF. The proposed project is not expected to impact any emergency response plans. CCF has on file with the San Bernardino County Fire Department a Business Emergency Response Plan. Upon approval of this proposed project, this Business Emergency Response Plan will be updated.

h) and i) The proposed project will not increase the existing risk of fire hazards in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees because it will not increase the use of flammable materials at the site. No substantial or native vegetation exists within the operational portions of CCF. Additionally, no substantial or native vegetation is located within the immediate vicinity of CCF

since this area is a long developed industrial area. Therefore, no significant increase in fire hazards is expected at CCF associated with the proposed project.

8.3 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required since no significant adverse hazard impacts have been identified.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☑
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☑
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☑
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☑
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☑

h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☑
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☑
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☑
k)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☑
l)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☑
m)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☑
n)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☑
o)	Require in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☑

9.1 Significance Criteria

Potential impacts on water resources will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

- The project will cause degradation or depletion of groundwater resources substantially affecting current or future uses.

- The project will cause the degradation of surface water substantially affecting current or future uses.

- The project will result in a violation of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements.

- The capacities of existing or proposed wastewater treatment facilities and the sanitary sewer system are not sufficient to meet the needs of the project.

- The project results in substantial increases in the area of impervious surfaces, such that interference with groundwater recharge efforts occurs.

- The project results in alterations to the course or flow of floodwaters.

- The existing water supply does not have the capacity to meet the increased demands of the project, or the project would use a substantial amount of potable water.

- The project increases demand for water by more than five million gallons per day.

9.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a), f), k), l) and o) CCF currently uses a permitted septic system for the management of human waste water. The existing CCF process wastewater is reused within the process and not discharged to the septic system. Only human wastewater is discharged through the septic system. The proposed project will not require additional employees. Therefore, no increased quantity of process waste water or septic waste is anticipated. As a result, no significant adverse impacts associated with waste water discharges are expected and no existing wastewater permits will need to be modified.

b) and n) Water is primarily provided by Fontana Water Company. Since the process changes to CCF are not expected to increase CCF demand of water, no adverse impacts on water demand are expected.

c), d), e) and m) The stormwater drainage from CCF currently exits the site at the southwest corner. Because the proposed project does not require any site preparation, grading, or construction of new structures, the proposed project is not projected to alter the stormwater runoff quantity or quality from CCF. No modifications to the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan are anticipated. No new storm drainage facilities or expansion of existing storm facilities are expected to be required. Since stormwater discharge or runoff is not expected to change in either volume or water quality, no significant stormwater quality impacts are expected to result from the operation of the proposed project.

g), h), i) and j) Based on the topography and/or site elevations in relation to the ocean, CCF is not expected to result in an increased risk of flood, seiche, tsunami or mud flow hazards. CCF would not locate housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. CCF is not located within a 100-

year flood hazard zone and no new expansion of CCF is planned. Therefore, no significant impacts associated with flooding are expected.

9.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to water quality and supply are expected as a result of the activities associated with the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☑

10.1 Significance Criteria

Land use and planning impacts will be considered significant if the project conflicts with the land use and zoning designations established by the San Bernardino County.

10.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a), b), and c) The proposed project occurs within the existing CCF property boundaries. Land use on CCF property is designated as IR, which is industrial regular zoning. The proposed project is consistent with the land use designation of industrial regular.

No new property will be acquired for CCF and there will be no impacts to established communities. Additionally, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with local habitat conservation plans, or natural community conservation plans, as CCF is located is entirely located within a previously developed industrial facility. The proposed project will not trigger changes in the current zoning designations at CCF. Based on these considerations, no significant adverse impacts to established residential or natural communities are expected.

Land use at CCF, and in the surrounding vicinity is consistent with the San Bernardino County General Plan land use designations. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts on land use are expected.

10.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to land use are expected to occur as a result of construction or operation of the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☑

11.1 Significance Criteria

Project-related impacts on mineral resources will be considered significant if any of the following conditions are met:

- The project would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.
- The proposed project results in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

11.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a) As the proposed project will be limited to the confines of the existing CCF boundaries, no loss of availability of known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state is expected. No mineral extraction is planned as part of the proposed project.

b) The proposed project is not expected to result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

11.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to mineral resources are expected to occur as a result of the proposed project so no mitigation measures are required.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE	Would the project result in:			
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☑
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☑
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☑
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☑
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☑

12.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts on noise will be considered significant if:

- Construction noise levels exceed the City of Fontana noise ordinance or, if the noise threshold is currently exceeded, project noise sources increase ambient noise levels by more than three decibels (dBA) at the site boundary. Construction noise levels will be considered significant if they exceed federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) noise standards for workers.

- The proposed project operational noise levels exceed any of the local noise ordinances at the site boundary or, if the noise threshold is currently exceeded, project noise sources increase ambient noise levels by more than three dBA at the site boundary.

12.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a), b) c) and d) CCF is occupied by and surrounded by other industrial land uses. No construction activity or other structural modifications to CCF are planned. Workers exposed to noise sources in excess of 85 dBA are required to participate in a hearing conservation program. Workers exposed to noise sources in excess of 90 dBA for an eight-hour period will be required to wear hearing protection devices that conform to Occupational Safety and Health Administration/National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) standards. Since the maximum noise levels from the operation of the equipment within CCF are expected to be 85 decibels or less, no significant impacts to workers during construction activities are expected.

e) and f) CCF is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Further, CCF is not located within the normal flight pattern of an airport. CCF is a currently operating industrial site with no structural modifications planned. Thus, the proposed project would not increase the noise levels to people residing or working in the area.

12.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse noise impacts are expected to occur as a result of the proposed project within CCF. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:			
a) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☑

b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☑

13.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts of the proposed project on population and housing will be considered significant if the following criteria are exceeded:

- The demand for temporary or permanent housing exceeds the existing supply.
- The proposed project produces additional population, housing or employment inconsistent with adopted plans either in terms of overall amount or location.

13.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a), b) and c) The proposed changes of chemical usage at CCF will not involve an increase, decrease or relocation of population. The proposed project will not have any anticipated labor requirements. Operation of CCF with the proposed project is not expected to require any new permanent employees at CCF. Therefore, proposed project and operation of CCF are not expected to have significant adverse impacts on population or housing, induce substantial population growth, or exceed the growth projections contained in any adopted plans. The permits being processed as part of this proposed project are not anticipated to require a vapor recovery system or Best Available Control Technology (BACT). However, if BACT is required, off the shelf hardware can be used similar to a carbon absorber that can be installed on existing equipment. The installation of this BACT would be done with existing staff and would not require construction.

13.3 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for the construction/operation of the project since no significant adverse impacts to population and housing are expected.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project:			
Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:			
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☑
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☑
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☑
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☑
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☑

14.1 Significance Criteria

Impacts on public services will be considered significant if the project results in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time or other performance objectives.

14.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a) CCF, already in place, is proposing only process modifications as part of the proposed project. CCF is currently serviced by the San Bernardino County Fire Department. No additional facilities or industrial developments are being proposed. The proposed project is not expected to cause significant impacts to the existing fire protection facilities.

b) The City of Fontana Police Department is the responding agency for law enforcement needs at CCF. The operation of the proposed project will not require additional workers. The proposed project will occur within the confines of the existing Facility. Therefore, no impacts to the local police department are expected related to the proposed project.

c), d) and e) No increase in the number of permanent workers is expected at CCF, therefore, there will be no increase in the local population and thus no impacts are expected to schools, parks, or other public facilities.

14.3 Mitigation Measures

Because no significant adverse impacts to public services are expected as a result of the proposed project, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION			
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of CCF would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☑
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☑

15.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts to recreation will be considered significant if:

- The project results in an increased demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities.
- The project adversely affects existing recreational opportunities.

15.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a) and b) The proposed project will not require new construction and would produce no significant changes in population densities since there are no future changes in workforce requirements for CCF. Additionally, the proposed project will not require additional workers. Thus, there will be no increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities. No significant adverse impacts to recreational facilities are expected.

15.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts to recreational resources are expected to occur as a result of implementing the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. SOLID/HAZARDOUS WASTE Would the project:				
a)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid and hazardous waste?	☐	☐	☑

16.1 Significance Criteria

The proposed project impacts on solid/hazardous waste will be considered significant if the following occur:

- The generation and disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous waste exceeds the capacity of designated landfills.

16.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

a) No new construction activities are planned within CCF. During operation of CCF and the proposed project, there is not expected to be an increase in the amount of solid waste generated, which are primarily generated from administrative or office activities. The proposed project is not expected to result in an increase in permanent employees at CCF, so no significant increase in solid waste is expected.

b) There are no hazardous waste disposal sites within the southern California area. Hazardous waste generated at CCF currently amounts to approximately ten 55-gallon metal drums per year on average. No increases in hazardous wastes are expected as a result of the proposed project. Hazardous waste would need to be disposed of at a hazardous waste disposal facility (either in-state or out-of-state). Two such facilities are the Chemical Waste Management Inc. (CWMI) Kettleman Hills facility in King's County, and the Safety-Kleen facility in Buttonwillow (Kern County). Kettleman Hills has an estimated 6.5 million cubic yard capacity and expects to continue receiving wastes for approximately 18 years under its current permit, or for approximately another 24 years with an approved permit modification. Buttonwillow receives

approximately 960 tons of hazardous waste per day and has a remaining capacity of approximately 10.3 million tons. The expected life of the Buttonwillow Landfill is approximately 35 years.

Hazardous waste also can be transported to permitted facilities outside of California. The nearest out-of-state landfills are U.S. Ecology, Inc., located in Beatty, Nevada; USPCI, Inc., in Murray, Utah; and Envirosafe Services of Idaho, Inc., in Mountain Home, Idaho. Incineration is provided at the following out-of-state facilities: Aptus, located in Aragonite, Utah and Coffeyville, Kansas; Rollins Environmental Services, Inc., located in Deer Park, Texas and Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Chemical Waste Management, Inc., in Port Arthur, Texas; and Waste Research & Reclamation Co., Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

Hazardous wastes produced by CCF have historically been transported for disposal at several different locations. The proposed project is not expected to increase the quantity of hazardous waste generated within CCF. Since the total amount of hazardous waste generated from CCF is approximately 550 gallons per year, the drums are stored within the secondary containment area of CCF and collected on average of once per year for disposal. Therefore, no significant impacts to hazardous waste disposal facilities are expected due to the proposed project. CCF is expected to continue to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid and hazardous wastes.

The permits being processed as part of this proposed project are not anticipated to require a vapor recovery system or Best Available Control Technology (BACT). However, if BACT is required, off the shelf hardware can be used similar to a carbon absorber that can be installed on existing equipment. Carbon absorber type of BACT have a typically long lifetime limiting the amount of carbon waste generated. The installation of this BACT would be done with existing staff and would not require construction. If the BACT filtration system cannot be recycled in California, disposal will take place as described above.

16.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts from waste generated or disposed of are expected and thus no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:			
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the	☐	☐	☑

	volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☑
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☑
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☑
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	☐	☐	☑
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☑
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☑

17.1 Significance Criteria

The impacts on transportation/traffic will be considered significant if any of the following criteria apply:

- Peak period levels on major arterials are disrupted to a point where level of service (LOS) is reduced to D or F for more than one month.
- An intersection's volume to capacity ratio increase by 0.02 (two percent) or more when the LOS is already D, E or F.
- A major roadway is closed to all through traffic, and no alternate route is available.
- There is an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.
- The demand for parking facilities is substantially increased.
- Water borne, rail car or air traffic is substantially altered.

- Traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians are substantially increased.

17.2 Environmental Setting and Impacts

CCF is located at 8395 Sultana Avenue, approximately 2.5 miles southeast of the intersection of Interstate 15 and Highway 210 in the Fontana area of San Bernardino County, California. Raw materials and chemicals currently delivered to CCF are routed through hazardous materials transportation routes and through areas designated as industrial within the local land use plan.

a) and b) The proposed project will produce no anticipated increase in worker transportation since there will be no new construction. The proposed project is expected to reduce the number of trucks entering and leaving CCF by approximately 28 CCF truck entries per year. This would be accomplished by initiating the bulk transport and storage of NW-200 and Carbo-NT. As a result, the proposed project will slightly reduce the volume-to-capacity ratio of nearby intersections, thus providing a slight improvement in the level-of-service at affected intersections.

c) The proposed project will take place within the boundaries of the existing Facility. The project will not involve the delivery of materials via air so no increase in air traffic is expected.

d) and e) The proposed project does not include modifications to any roadways that could increase traffic hazards or create incompatible uses at or adjacent to the site. The proposed process modification will result in a reduction in traffic of about 28 truck trips per year. The trucks will access CCF using existing streets and access points. No new streets or entrances/exits to CCF are required. Emergency access at CCF will not be adversely affected by the proposed process modification and California Cascade will continue to maintain the existing emergency access gates.

f) No additional parking will be required as part of the process modifications to CCF. Parking for CCF is within the confines of the existing site. No increase in permanent workers is expected. Therefore, the proposed process modifications to CCF will not result in significant impacts on parking.

g) The proposed modification is to the process only and will end up with a reduced level of traffic in the vicinity of CCF. Therefore, these process modifications are not expected to conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation modes (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

17.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to transportation/traffic are expected and thus mitigation measures are not required.

Potentially Less Than No Impact

		Significant Impact	Significant Impact	
XVIII.	**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**			
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☑
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)	☐	☐	☑
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☑

a) The proposed project does not have the potential to adversely affect the environment, reduce or eliminate any plant or animal species or destroy prehistoric records of the past. The proposed project is located at a site that is part of an existing industrial facility, which has been previously disturbed, graded and developed, and this project will not extend into environmentally sensitive areas but will remain within the confines of an existing, industrial facility.

b) and c) The proposed changes are not expected to result in significant adverse cumulative impacts, nor are expected to have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Increased quantities of NW-200 transported to CCF are anticipated to have a less than one pound per day ammonia (NH_3) emission increase. Increases in the quantity of NW-200 allowed for transport to CCF will reduce the risk of a tanker truck accident and rupture. Therefore, since no project specific impacts were identified for any environmental topic areas, no impacts were considered to be cumulatively considerable as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a)(3). Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to generate significant adverse cumulative impacts in any environmental topic area.